

*External Affairs*

There are a few questions I should like to put. How many people in Canada appreciate the value of the United Nations? How many people in Canada know what goes on there? I am afraid the number is comparatively small. I am afraid that Canadians, as a whole, are unaware of the United Nations, although it is very important to them. And why? Because no one takes the trouble to tell them what goes on at the United Nations.

Let me give the house some examples: There is no permanent representative of the Canadian press at the United Nations. There is no permanent representative of any Canadian newspaper or periodical at the United Nations. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation covers the United Nations activities on a part-time basis and, on the whole, does a good job. We all know Peter Stursberg, Herbert Desaulniers and Walter O'Hearn who, up until recently, were there. These three gentlemen do a fairly good job—I should say they do a very good job—in so far as they are able, in reporting the activities of the United Nations over the radio and through comment in the press. But of the three of them, only two are left. I am here to say that, after having examined the situation slightly, I admit that in my view the C.B.C. could be more aggressive. I think they could bring United Nations programs more to the attention of the private stations and the Canadian people generally.

I am well aware, for example, and I am told by my C.B.C. friends and my friends who are connected with the press that Canadians are not particularly interested in the United Nations. Well, I put that to the test. At Christmastime, and since, I have been attending meetings of clubs and other societies, particularly schools, delivering speeches. And on every occasion, when the facts have been brought to the attention of the people concerned, they have shown a great deal of interest and that they are hungry for information. This makes it clear, to my mind, that if we go out and bring the facts to the attention of the people, in due course they will respond.

Surely that is the job of the C.B.C. and other organizations. Occasionally some other wealthy Canadian newspaper may send down a reporter or feature writer to New York for two or three days. But what are two or three days when one is trying to interpret the making of history? It is not sufficient time for the reporter or feature writer to get the background of the question under discussion, to meet the people concerned, to get the know-all, and to get the views of other correspondents and of the 60 other member nations.

[Mr. Macnaughton.]

I can speak from personal experience because I was fortunate enough to be designated the Canadian representative on committee No. 6 which, as you know, is the legal committee. Hon. members will recall that the general assembly deals with its business under the heading of six main committees. These are: The political and security committee; the economic and financial committee; the social, humanitarian and cultural committee; the trusteeship, including non-self-governing territories committee; the administrative and budgeting committee; and finally, as I say, the legal committee.

Only to mention these names shows, it seems to me, the importance of the subjects discussed. I admit the political and security committee puts on the best show because there you see the clash of personalities and of nationalities, but I maintain that long after the effervescent activities of the political committee have faded away, the good that the United Nations will accomplish will be put down in conventions and treaties drafted and examined by committee No. 6. In any event the purpose of the United Nations, it seems to me, is to reduce tension, to iron out friction through discussion, to secure the rule of law in the relations between states, and not to resort to war.

Like the other delegates on the other committees, it was my job on committee No. 6, the legal committee, to speak on certain subjects of direct concern to Canada. For example, on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, the revision of the United Nations charter, and the proposal dealing with arbitrarial procedure which, as hon. members will readily realize, is a new branch of international law under which two nations to a dispute resolve to arbitrate and refer their dispute to, shall we say, the international court of justice; also to discuss the interim report of the international law commission which was dealing with the regime of the high seas, which in turn can be broken down into territorial waters, the continental shelf, and fisheries.

I do not imagine that what I said at committee No. 6 will find any permanent place in any anthology of famous prose, but I do feel the question of, for example, the continental shelf and fisheries would prove of great interest to the citizens of Newfoundland, the maritimes, and British Columbia.

What of the exploration and exploitation of the continental shelf? Will we find oil, coal, and minerals in the subsoil? How far does Canada extend into the high seas? Who will regulate our fisheries? Should they be regulated at all? It seems to me that these are practical subjects of great economic import and of great interest to Canada, and if